

To: Gil HAWKINS [gilhawkins@verizon.net]
Cc: Scott Fallon [fallon@northjersey.com]; heehan Bill [captain@hackensackriverkeeper.org]; alter Mugdan/R2/USEPA/US@EPA[]
From: jill kleinman
Sent: Sun 6/24/2012 9:09:49 PM
Subject: Re: Passaic/Quanta
[signature.jpg](#)
gilhawkins@verizon.net
http://www.northjersey.com/news/160110915_Barges_may_haul_out_dioxin.html?c=y&page=2
[201-446-2652](tel:201-446-2652)

Gil,
I completely agree with your analysis. I was totally flabbergasted when I read this article on Saturday. I can only assume that none of the 70 PRP's are the global giant Honeywell.

Jill Kleinman
QCAGE

On Sun, Jun 24, 2012 at 12:49 PM, Gil HAWKINS <gilhawkins@verizon.net> wrote:
Scott, I had a hard time finding your story
<http://www.northjersey.com/news/160110915_Barges_may_haul_out_dioxin.html?c=y&page=2> on the Passaic R. cleanup on the web site, but did read it in the hard copy. Interesting that the EPA rejected removal (Barge or otherwise) from the Edgewater Honeywell Quanta site and is favoring barge removal from the Passaic River site. It seems to me that the in-situ solidification remedy in the Quanta ROD might be more suited to the Passaic site and removal would be better where the population density (Edgewater) and a National Heritage River are more at risk for future contamination. All the negative reasons for removal at Quanta are now compromised by the Passaic remediation proposals only a few miles away and on a more limiting waterway than the Hudson River.
Gil

Gil Hawkins ~~~<^><...
Environmental Affairs
Hudson River Fishermen's Association
201-446-2652